

Remarks

Claims 1, 3 and 7 through 14 remain pending in the application. Claims 2, 4 through 6 and 15 are cancelled. Claims 1, 3, 7 through 9, 13 and 14 are amended.

The office action rejects claims 6 and 7 under 35 U.S.C §112 for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claim 6 is cancelled and claim 7 is amended to depend from amended claim 1 which defines the term Wsubn. The term "nonlinear coupling mapping function" in claim 7 is also amended to "nonlinear mapping function", to be consistent with the wording of the amended claim 1, and is also supported by page 25, line 10-12 of the original specification.

The office action rejects claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §101. Claim 15 is cancelled.

The office action objects to claims 6, 7 and 10 as dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and corrections are made to overcome the §112 rejection advanced for claims 6 and 9. Claim 1 is amended to incorporate the features of dependent claims 2 and 4 through 6 in order to place the application in condition for allowance. In addition, g_i is clarified to represent the nonlinear mapping function, as supported by page 25, line 8-12 of the original specification. Further, the erroneous expression of "n is the index extracted feature" is corrected to "n is the index of the extracted feature", as also

supported by page 9, line 17 of the original specification. The dependencies of claims 3, 7, 8 have been adapted accordingly.

Claim 9 is amended to define that w_n is weight of the extracted feature, as supported by page 26, line 16 of the original specification. Further, the erroneous expression of "n is the nth extracted feature" is corrected to "n is the index of the extracted feature".

Claims 13 and 14 have been amended in accordance with amended claim 1. Since claim 13 defines a device for performing the method of claim 1 and claim 14 defines a computer readable medium having a program for performing the method of claim 1, the amendment to claims 13 and 14 are also supported.

Conclusion

This response has addressed all of the Examiner's grounds of objection and rejection. Reconsideration of the objections and rejections and allowance of the claims is requested.

Date: February 3, 2009

By: /Niky Economy Syrengelas/
Niky Economy Syrengelas, Esq.

Reg. No. 46680